
Eurosurveillance, Volume 8, Issue 51, 16 December 2004

Articles

Citation style for this article: Olowokure B. Indirect community protection against influenza by vaccinating children: a review of two recent studies from Italy and the United States. *Euro Surveill.* 2004;8(51):pii=2605. Available online: <http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=2605>

Indirect community protection against influenza by vaccinating children: a review of two recent studies from Italy and the United States

Rachel Jordan^{1,2} (r.e.jordan@bham.ac.uk) and Babatunde Olowokure^{1,2}

¹Health Protection Agency West Midlands Regional Surveillance Unit, England

²Department of Public Health & Epidemiology, University of Birmingham, England

A secondary effect of influenza in childhood is the impact -medical, social and economic- on the family. Two recently published studies have considered how the vaccination of children against influenza may help control the spread of influenza through indirect protection of susceptible persons.

An Italian study [1] conducted prospective multicentre research into children with respiratory tract infections (RTI) to determine the burden of laboratory confirmed influenza in healthy children and their households. Altogether, 3771 otherwise healthy children aged <14 years and presenting to primary care centres and emergency departments with symptoms of RTI were followed up until the resolution of their illness; 352 (9.3%) were positive for influenza virus. Children with laboratory confirmed influenza were significantly more likely to present with fever ($p<0.0001$) and with croup ($p<0.0001$). They also had significantly longer mean school absence (5.10 days (standard deviation (SD) 2.55) versus 4.25 days (SD 2.93), $p<0.0001$), although the prevalence of hospitalisation was similar. The households of influenza positive children had significantly more respiratory tract infections (15.1% versus 9.5%, $p<0.0001$), medical outpatient visits ($p<0.0001$), lost work days ($p<0.0001$ for their own illness; and, $p<0.0001$ for their child's illness) and lost school days for siblings ($p<0.0001$).

The results of this study suggest that influenza is likely to be transmitted to household contacts and has a substantial household impact in terms of illness and lost school and work days. The authors conclude that these effects could be reduced by the vaccination of healthy children. However, there were no significant differences in hospitalisation rates between the groups, no information on the ages of other siblings that might determine both sibling and parental absence, or any mention of loss-to-follow up.

A study from the United States [2] performed a non-randomised community-based controlled trial in five communities to assess the benefit of vaccinating children with cold-adapted intranasal

influenza vaccine. Healthy children aged 18 months to 18 years in two of the communities were offered vaccine for three consecutive years. The analysis was restricted to members of a particular health plan, which, in the intervention towns, comprised approximately half of those vaccinated and covered approximately two thirds of the population, but covered only about 10% of the population in the comparison towns. Any differences between the health plan population and the rest of the population are not described. Age-specific rates of medically attended acute respiratory illnesses during the influenza outbreak period were calculated for both the intervention and control communities. Altogether, 20%-25% of eligible children in vaccination communities received vaccine each season, which was generally a good match to the circulating virus.

The authors reported a significant indirect protection in adults aged 35 years and over although percentage differences in illness rate between the intervention and control arms appeared quite small: 17.6 % compared with 18.6% in year 1, 17.1 versus 18.8% in year 2, and 15.1 versus 17.8% in year 3, giving a protective efficacy (1 minus relative risk) of 8% (95% confidence interval (CI) 4%, 13%), 18% (95% CI 14%, 22%) and 15% (95% CI 12%, 19%) in years 1-3 respectively. This small effect may be translated into quite a substantial absolute number of consultations when multiplied up for population size, but appeared to have little effect on herd immunity during the influenza epidemics. This may be partly explained by the low uptake of less than 25% and may be diluted by using clinical rather than laboratory endpoints. Studies with a higher uptake rate, a randomised design and larger numbers of communities are needed to define the levels of indirect protection that could be achieved.

The evidence for the protection of the community against influenza by vaccinating children is limited. There are several randomised controlled trials which address the protection of household or school contacts inadequately, usually as a lower order outcome measure for which the study is not designed [3-8] Until now, only one community intervention trial [9] and one large ecological 'natural experiment' in Japan that assessed the effects on the wider community of vaccinating school children, had been made [10]. Both are suggestive of population benefit, but not necessarily conclusive. The US study [2] had a similar design to the community intervention study [9], but examined a larger number of communities and had a more consistent system for identifying respiratory illness (although it also had incomplete follow-up). Unfortunately, vaccine coverage was only about one quarter of that in the earlier Japanese study.

There is considerable variation in influenza vaccination policy in Europe – a table showing the current recommendations is available on the European Influenza Surveillance Scheme website (<http://www.eiss.org/html/vaccination.html>). The most common policy is to target high-risk groups (such as the elderly). This, however, can never be fully successful, despite high coverage, as influenza vaccine has lower efficacy in these patients, particularly frail, elderly people. There is evidence that children play a major role in the transmission of influenza to vulnerable persons [11]. Therefore, a complementary strategy would be to provide indirect protection by vaccinating children, which would also have the benefit of direct protection to those vaccinated. Indeed, to reduce disease in children the US has recommended vaccination of all aged 6-23 months since 2003. Both of the studies reviewed suggest that indirect protection could be achieved in the community by the vaccination of healthy children. However, neither provides sufficient evidence to support this claim or to warrant the intervention at present, particularly at the levels of vaccine coverage observed.

References:

1. Principi N, Esposito S, Gasparini R, Marchisio P, Crovari P, Flu-Flu Study Group. Burden of influenza in healthy children and their households. *Arch Dis Child* 2004; 89(11):1002-7. (abstract available at <http://adc.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/abstract/89/11/1002>)
2. Piedra PA, Gaglani MJ, Kozinetz CA, Herschler G, Riggs M, Griffith M, et al. Herd immunity in adults against influenza-related illnesses with use of the trivalent-live attenuated influenza vaccine (CAIV-T) in children. *Vaccine*. In press 2004. (abstract

- available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2004.09.025>) [accessed 15 December 2004]
3. Hurwitz ES, Haber M, Chang A, Shope T, Teo S, Ginsberg M, et al. Effectiveness of influenza vaccination of day care children in reducing influenza-related morbidity among household contacts. *JAMA* 2000; 284(13):1677-82.
 4. Colombo C, Argiolas L, La Vecchia C, Negri E, Meloni G, Meloni T. Influenza vaccine in healthy preschool children. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique* 2001; 49(2):157-162.
 5. Clover RD, Crawford S, Glezen WP, Taber LH, Matson CC, Couch RB. Comparison of heterotypic protection against influenza A/Taiwan/86 (H1N1) by attenuated and inactivated vaccines to A/Chile/83-like viruses. *J Infect Dis* 1991; 163(2):300-34.
 6. Gruber WC, Taber LH, Glezen WP, Clover RD, Abell TD, Demmler RW, et al. Live attenuated and inactivated influenza vaccine in school-age children. *Am J Dis Child* 1990; 144(5):595-600.
 7. Principi N, Esposito S, Marchisio P, Gasparini R, Crovari P. Socioeconomic impact of influenza on healthy children and their families. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2003; 22(10 Suppl):S207-S210. (abstract available at <http://www.pidj.org/pt/re/pidj/abstract.00006454-200310001-00003.htm>)
 8. Esposito S, Marchisio P, Cavagna R, Gironi S, Bosis S, Lambertini L, et al. Effectiveness of influenza vaccination of children with recurrent respiratory tract infections in reducing respiratory-related morbidity within the households. *Vaccine* 2003; 21(23):3162-8.
 9. Monto AS, Davenport FM, Napier JA, Francis T Jr. Modification of an outbreak of influenza in Tecumseh, Michigan by vaccination of schoolchildren. *J Infect Dis* 1970; 122(1):16-25.
 10. Reichert TA, Sugaya N, Fedson DS, Glezen WP, Simonsen L, Tashiro M. The Japanese experience with vaccinating schoolchildren against influenza. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 344(12):889-96.
 11. Principi N, Esposito S. Are we ready for universal influenza vaccination in paediatrics? *Lancet Infect Dis* 2004; 4(2):75-83. (abstract available at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(04\)00926-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(04)00926-0))

◀ [Back to Table of Contents](#)

◀ [Previous](#)

[Advanced search](#)

-  [RSS Feed](#)
-  [Subscribe](#)
-  [Unsubscribe](#)
-  [Contact](#)
-  [Sitemap](#)

→ [All press releases](#)



In this issue

- ▶ [ECDC director chosen at second management board meeting](#)
- ▶ [International outbreak of Salmonella Thompson caused by contaminated rucola salad - update](#)
- ▶ [Trends in antimicrobial resistance in Europe: report from EARSS](#)
- ▶ [BSE agent in goat tissue: precautions discussed](#)
- ▶ [Indirect community protection against influenza by vaccinating children: a review of two recent studies from Italy and the United States](#)

Related articles

- ▶ [The impact of the 2009 influenza A\(H1N1\) pandemic on attitudes of healthcare workers toward seasonal influenza vaccination 2010/11](#)
- ▶ [Influenza vaccine effectiveness, 2010/11](#)
- ▶ [Early estimates of seasonal influenza vaccine effectiveness in Europe, 2010/11: I-MOVE, a multicentre case-control study](#)
- ▶ [Effectiveness of the 2010/11 seasonal trivalent influenza vaccine in Spain: preliminary results of a case-control study](#)
- ▶ [2010-2011 influenza seasonal vaccine, preliminary mid-season effectiveness estimates: reason for concern, confounding or are we following the right track?](#)

Disclaimer: The opinions expressed by authors contributing to *Eurosurveillance* do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) or the editorial team or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated. Neither ECDC nor any person acting on behalf of ECDC is responsible for the use that might be made of the information in this journal.

The information provided on the *Eurosurveillance* site is designed to support, not replace, the relationship that exists between a patient/site visitor and his/her physician. Our website does not host any form of commercial advertisement.

Eurosurveillance [ISSN] - ©2007-2011. All rights reserved



This site complies with the [HONcode standard for trustworthy health information](#):
[verify here](#).